9/23/68

Dear Dick,

Enclosed is a copy of my today's letter to Sprague.

On the Lovelady picture: I have none that size and were I to make a copy from the print I have, it would cost within pennies what one from the Archives, a generation younger, would. Write them, enclosing $1.50, give them the identification, and they'll send you an 8x10. It will cost less than sending mine to you registered and getting it back the same way.

I've read your 9/18 carefully and, as you know, agree. On Van Der Kerr, please do what you can, for I have less time daily, there each day arrising new things that should be done and others do not do. I'm also trying to get in some much needed physical exercise, which reduces the time for this work, and I'm making a conscientious effort to get a decent night's sleep, for the first time in five years. I want to be better prepared for the lengthening pull.

It is almost invariably an error to assume cooperation. This is one of our continuing problems. Some of us do this instinctively. Some never do it, as you will learn, and perhaps it is better that you learn it for yourself for were it reported to you it might prejudice you against either the reporter or the non-cooperator. Trent knows about COUP, asked to read it, and has given me no inkling that he has what might be a worthwhile addition. He may just not have thought of it, however. Or, he may have plans requiring he hold it out.

Had a pleasant visit with the Bob Castorr's yesterday evening and night. I'll be seeing them again soon. They are quite cooperative.

It is not necessary to destroy what I send you unless you think it advisable. I had tougher things to say, face to face, in N.O. They do not endear me but they are necessary. The fuckup there is precise and scientific. I have come to the point that I wonder about some of the people. Because of his persistent double-crossing, what cannot be accidental, I toldm one to his face that I henceforth would not trust him. Jim was present and not happy about the event or what I disclosed to him about the operation of his office. I can add this thing, about which I also have misgivings: when they are in New Orleans and know the local situation better than anyone else, they let live things go (and you cannot imagine how live) to crap around with what is outside their jurisdiction. Now I am not suggesting they should not have interest in other things. But when they have limited finances, staff and competence, they might better concentrate on what they might do something with. Their failure to follow up what I had turned over to them in the first half of July lost them an important witness on the Shaw case. I have that person on tape, but it is not the same things as an affidavit to them, and that person is now dead. Another "accident"! There are important Shaw things they have not even tried to check out, where I have already established the fact and developed the witnesses. Further, I made specific deals with Jim on one aspect and he without second thought violated it. I cannot make arrangements with people as a basis of their talking to me if I cannot make good on my word. Henceforth, this means that I will be more limited in what I can accomplish. In any event, I've tied Shaw in with other aspects of the assassination story.

I get the Free Press only. Someone gave me a sub. I get the N.O. papers and just forced the T-P to print a retraction on their Bringuier-suit story.

I am without confidence in Broshears and have the deepest misgivings about Jaffe having signed such a story. They are to make a joint public appearance. I think the effort to check the Corpus Christi thing out failed. I have no reason to trust it, either, or, to put if the opposite way, not to mistrust it.